

ImageSilo Enterprise Content Management RFP

Question 1

Regarding Section 7.4 – Computing Environment Security Controls of the RFP, which states:

“The Proposer’s computing environment must comply with the following Regulatory Standards: COBIT ✓ COSO ✓ ITIL ✓ NIST ✓ ISO 27001 ✓ ISO 27002 ✓ FISMA.”

Our proposed solution, ImageSilo, is a secure, cloud-based system that undergoes an annual SOC 2 Type II audit, which includes rigorous evaluation of security, availability, and confidentiality controls. While ImageSilo does not specifically claim compliance with each of the listed frameworks, it aligns with many of the principles and intent outlined in those standards.

Would the agency consider revising the language to allow for equivalent security posture—for example:

“The Proposer’s computing environment should align with the intent of the following regulatory standards...”

This would allow vendors who meet or exceed industry best practices (via SOC 2, ISO, or similar programs) to participate while still maintaining a strong security posture for the project.

Please let us know if such flexibility would be acceptable.

Q1 Answer:

Yes, section 7.4, specifically the below line can be changed...

From:

“The Proposer’s computing environment must comply with the following Regulatory Standards: COBIT ✓ COSO ✓ ITIL ✓ NIST ✓ ISO 27001 ✓ ISO 27002 ✓ FISMA.”

To:

“The Proposer’s computing environment should align with the intent of following Regulatory Standards: COBIT ✓ COSO ✓ ITIL ✓ NIST ✓ ISO 27001 ✓ ISO 27002 ✓ FISMA.”

Question 2-

RFP Question – MWBE / SDVOB Applicability to SaaS Cost Structure

Sections 4 and 14.1.7 establish MWBE and SDVOB participation goals and assign up to 10 evaluation points based on participation and workforce diversity.

This procurement is primarily a SaaS-based Enterprise Content Management platform, with pricing driven by software licensing and per-GB storage consumption, rather than labor-based or subcontractable services. A substantial portion of total contract expenditures therefore consists of non-subcontractable pass-through software, licensing, and hosting costs.

To ensure accurate application of Executive Law Article 15-A and 5 NYCRR Parts 142–144, and to avoid structural scoring disadvantages unrelated to service quality or cost, please clarify whether the Agencies will:

1. Exclude SaaS licensing, storage, and OEM hosting costs from MWBE and SDVOB participation percentage calculations and apply goals only to subcontractable professional services (e.g., implementation, training, migration, support); and/or
2. Convert MWBE/SDVOB participation to a good-faith-efforts requirement without associated evaluation scoring under Section 14.1.7; and/or
3. Permit proposers to request a partial or full waiver of MWBE/SDVOB goals where subcontracting is not commercially feasible due to the SaaS pricing model.

This clarification is requested to ensure equitable competition and alignment with best-value procurement principles.

Q2 Answer:

Proposers should submit their strongest proposal, ensuring it addresses both the scope of work and the MWBE/SDVOB participation goals outlined in the RFP. If meeting these MWBE/SDVOB goals is not possible, a partial or full waiver request with appropriate justification may be submitted for agency approval. Separately, workforce diversity is evaluated, and teams proposing a diverse project workforce can earn points under this category.

[PROC-3- MWBE Waiver Request Form](#)

[PROC-10- Certification of Good Faith Efforts](#)

Question 3

Migration Scope, Cost, and Billing During Transition

Question:

The Agencies currently maintain approximately **4.1 TB of active ImageSilo data** in production. In the event that the selected proposer is a different ImageSilo reseller or hosting entity than the incumbent, a full data migration would be required, including export, secure transfer, re-ingestion, reconciliation, validation, and production cutover.

Please clarify:

1. **Whether proposers are expected to include the full cost of such a migration** (including reconciliation, testing, validation, and downtime mitigation) in their Cost Proposal;

Answer: Not applicable. ImageSilo is the Agencies' permanent solution.

2. **If migration costs are not required to be included**, please clarify whether and how the Agencies intend to consider these costs as part of overall **best-value determination**;

Answer: Not applicable. ImageSilo is the Agencies' permanent solution.

3. **Whether the Agencies expect proposers to demonstrate prior experience** performing large-scale ImageSilo migrations (multi-terabyte production environments) as part of the Technical Proposal; and

Answer: See Subsection 12.2.1 titled "Overview and Experience" of Section 12.2 of the Technical Proposal.

4. **During any migration and reconciliation period in which data may temporarily reside in both the incumbent and new reseller environments**, please clarify whether:

- The new reseller may begin charging its **monthly service and storage fees**, and
- The Agencies anticipate **overlapping or concurrent monthly charges** from both resellers during this transition period.

Answer: Not applicable. ImageSilo is the Agencies' permanent solution.

This clarification is requested to ensure accurate cost comparison, avoid unanticipated dual-billing scenarios, and prevent material post-award change orders related to transition activities.

Question 4

Does the Agency require proposers to demonstrate prior experience migrating large-scale ImageSilo repositories (multi-TB, production environments) between hosting entities or resellers without data loss or extended downtime?

Q4 Answer: The Proposer is expected to respond to the technical proposal questions in Section 12.2 of the RFP.

Question 5

The Agencies currently utilize a custom user authentication method as part of the existing ImageSilo implementation.

In the event that the selected proposer is a new ImageSilo reseller or hosting entity, please clarify whether proposers are expected to include in their Cost Proposal the effort and cost required to recreate, integrate, test, and validate this custom authentication method within their environment.

Q5 Answer: The scope of services in the RFP was amended to include the New York State (NY.GOV) authentication method. See Section 7 titled Scope of Services of the revised RFP. See addendum 3 dated January 6, 2026.

Question 6

Section B – Incremental Storage Charges requests a Monthly Minimum Charge and Monthly Maximum Charge for each storage increment while also referencing “Monthly Charge per Gigabyte.”

Please clarify:

1. Whether the Agencies expect proposers to provide a **single fixed per-GB rate** for each storage tier?

Answer: Proposers are required to complete the Cost Proposal Template which includes, but is not limited to, Section B of the Cost Proposal.

2. How this pricing section matches the previous pricing page by GB and by year.

Answer: For an apples to apples comparison in evaluating cost proposals, the Agencies are providing 4,100 GB per year as a baseline.

Question 7

Several of the clarification questions submitted relate to **interdependent technical and cost assumptions** (e.g., data migration scope, storage billing methodology, authentication reimplementation, and transition-period billing).

To ensure proposers can submit accurate, consistent, and fully informed responses, the proposer respectfully requests that the Agencies consider allowing a brief follow-up Q&A window or limited extension of the question submission deadline after initial responses are issued, solely for clarification of any newly introduced dependencies.

Q7 Answer: The deadline for questions from prospective proposers concluded on December 29, 2025 at 12pm EST.

Question 8

I wanted to know if HCR would be interested in a proposal to move off ImageSilo for an alternate solution that offers identical functionality and additional features? I would like to submit a proposal with this information if HCR would be willing to consider it. Please let me know and I will begin crafting a response.

Q8 Answer: See Section 7 of the RFP titled "Scope of Services".

Question 9

The RFP states:

"A complete proposal for this RFP is comprised of five (5) separate tabs:

- (i) Tab One: Proposal Cover Sheet, Cover Letter and Proposal Certification;
- (ii) Tab Two: Technical Proposal;
- (iii) Tab Three: Cost Proposal;
- (iv) Tab Four: Administrative Proposal; and
- (v) Tab Five: EEO, Diversity and SDVOB Proposal."

Does this requirement mean that we must submit five separate PDF files, one for each tab, or a single PDF file bookmarked by tab number?

Q9 Answer: Yes, five separate PDF files.